



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|--------------------------|------------------|
| 10/519,885 | 12/30/2004 | Makoto Kato | 10407-123US(A4004MT-US1) | 2746 |

570 7590 01/18/2008
PANITCH SCHWARZE BELISARIO & NADEL LLP
ONE COMMERCE SQUARE
2005 MARKET STREET, SUITE 2200
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103

| |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

BOR, HELENE CATHERINE

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

3768

| | |
|-----------|---------------|
| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|-----------|---------------|

01/18/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------|--------------|--|
| Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/519,885 | KATO ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Helene Bor | 3768 | |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Helene Bor. (3) Clark A. Jablon.
 (2) Eric Winakur. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 10 January 2008.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 14.


Identification of prior art discussed: US6398732, US6030344 and US5411028.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The applicant compared the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art of record. Applicant discussed proposed amendment language. The applicant will take into consideration the discussion when filing the formal response.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.


ERIC F. WINAKUR
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

 Examiner's signature, if required